

U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
N.D. OF N.Y.  
FILED

JUN 21 2010

LAWRENCE K. BAERMAN, CLERK  
ALBANY

Richard-Enrique; Ulloa  
c/o postal department 771  
Stone Ridge, New York republic

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

CASE # 1:10-CV-00467  
TJM/DRH

COUNTY OF ULSTER, NEW YORK )  
THE TOWN OF LLOYD, NEW YORK, )  
TOWN OF ROSENDALE, NEW YORK, )  
TOWN OF ULSTER, NEW YORK )  
DARRELL DAY, EUGENE J. RIZZO, )  
DANIEL M. MARTUSCELLO, )  
HEATHER BLUME, ANTHONY )  
KALIMERAS, KATHLEEN BURNS )  
JEFF COHEN, DAVID M. ACKERT, )  
AMY SHUMAN, ROBERT VOSPER, )  
JOSHUA CALIENDO, BEATRICE )  
HAVRANEK, EILEEN B. KATASKY )  
NINA POSUPACK, NEREIDA VEYTIA )

Plaintiffs,

-against-

RICHARD ENRIQUE ULLOA, SARA )  
ULLOA, JEFFREY-CHARLES )  
BURFEINDT, ED-GEORGE )  
PARENTEAU, RAYMOND )  
TOMKINS, KATERINE A. CAIRO )  
DAVIS, KATHY STEINHILBER, )

Defendants

MOTION TO RECONSIDER  
JUDGES ORDER FOR TIME  
EXTENSION FOR GENERAL  
ORDER #14

**MOTION TO RECONSIDER JUDGES ORDER FOR TIME EXTENSION OF  
GENERAL ORDER #14**

1 Comes now Richard-Enrique; Ulloa, by special visitation and not appearing  
2 generally, before this court seeking a remedy, by "The Saving to the Suitors Clause" at  
3 USC 28 -1333(1). I respectfully request the indulgence of this court as I am not schooled  
4 in law. This is provided by the precedent set by Haines vs. Kerner at 404 U.S. 519

---

5  
6 I submit this Motion to Reconsider in order to strike and or invalidate from the  
7 record, Docket #4 and #5 of this case, due to the fact that this document was not in the  
8 proper form of a motion, no notice of motion was ever created or served, no motion  
9 created or served, an no Memorandum of Law was created or entered into the record, and  
10 the "pretend" motion/letter was NEVER served on defense, and

11 The General Order #14 or Local Rule 9.2 allows the extension of time based on the  
12 service or non service of the Defendants. The time limit set of 30 days is not based on the  
13 parties being served, and

14 I demand that the letter in docket numbers #4 and #5, be stricken from the record as it  
15 is not in proper form and reason provided by the plaintiff's attorney, is not based on any  
16 rule, local rule or case law, and is in improper form violating Federal Rules 7 and 10, and  
17 Local Rule 10.1.

18 Local Rule 9.2 and 18 U.S.C. § 1961, clearly states that "the party asserting such a  
19 claim shall file a RICO statement within thirty (30) days of the filing of the pleading  
20 containing such a claim", it does not allow for extension of time due to a service issue on  
21 the plaintiff's, nor does it state that an EX PARTE letter can be submitted as a substitute  
22 for a Motion paper, in the proper form as described in Local Rule 10.1, as a matter of law  
23 this Complaint should be dismissed.

24 I pray to our Heavenly Father and not this court that justice be done.



Richard-Enrique; Ulloa

Date: June 18, 2010

**Proof and Evidence of Service**

I, Richard-Enrique; Ulloa: *declare that I served by filing one copy of the "MOTION TO RECONSIDER" by "hand-delivered by private carrier-service on "USDC of Northern NY" sent by post-office-first class-mail AND OR CERTIFIED MAIL to the following:*

BAILEY, KELLEHER & JOHNSON, P.C	USDC OF NORTHERN NY
JOHN W. BAILEY	COURT CLERK
5 PINE WEST PLAZA, SUITE 507	445 Broadway, Room 509
ALBANY, NEW YORK 12205	ALBANY, NEW YORK 12207
First class mail	First class mail



Richard-Enrique; Ulloa

June 18, 2010

**NOTICE TO THE AGENT IS NOTICE TO THE PRINCIPAL NOTICE TO**  
**THE PRINCIPAL IS NOTICE TO THE AGENT**